

The 6th February, 1995

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./177.— In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XJV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Haryana Refractories (P) Ltd., Faridabad *versus* Shri Ram Bachan.

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 195/94**

*between*

**THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA REFRACTORIES (P) LTD.,  
PLOT NO. 65-66, SECTOR 25, FARIDABAD**

*and*

**THE WORKMAN NAMELY :—SHRI RAM BACHAN C/O FARIDABAD KAMGAR  
(REGD.), CITU OFFICE, BHUD COLONY,  
OLD FARIDABAD.**

*Present :*

Shri Rakesh Bansal, for the workman.

None, for the management.

**AWARD**

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes 1947 Act, (here-in-after referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government, Endorsement No. 247949—54, dated 24th June, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Bachan, is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief, is he entitled to ?

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed by the management as operator on 4th October, 1975 and his last drawn wages were Rs. 1,119.60. The employees union served a demand notice dated 10th April, 1993 on the management giving 15 days time to settle the demands. The management instead of settling the dispute all of a sudden on 1st July, 1993 stopped the present workman and 22 other workmen on the gate. They lodged a complaint with the Labour Inspector and the management was summoned to appear and produce record on 13th July, 1993. The management did not produce the record before the Labour Inspector on 13th July, 1993 and so they were advised to serve demand notice. The termination of his services effected in this manner by the management is illegal and unjustified. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service with full back wages.

3. Notice was sent to the management under registered cover to appear in the court but it was received back undelivered with the remarks of the postal authorities that they had refused to take notice. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has led evidence by filing affidavit containing the aforesaid position.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted position given in the affidavit that the services of the workman were terminated illegally in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

**U. B. KHANDUJA,**

Dated the 23rd December, 1994.

**Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.**

Endorsement No. 70, dated the 2nd January, 1995.

A copy with three spare copies is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./178.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Refractories (P) Ltd. Faridabad *versus* Shri Sovin.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 201/94

*between*

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA REFRactories (P) LTD.,  
PLOT NO. 65-66, SECTOR-25, FARIDABAD

*and*

THE WORKMAN NAMELY:— SHRI SOVIN C/O FARIDABAD KAMGAR  
UNION (REGD.) CITU OFFICE, BHUD COLONY, OLD FARIDABAD

*Present :*

Shri Rakesh Bansal, for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above to this court for adjudication,— vide Haryana Govt. Endst. No. 24786—91, dated 24th June, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sovin, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief, is he entitled to?

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed by management as Moulder on 1st January, 1973 and his last drawn wages were Rs. 1,134.60. The employees union served a demand notice dated 10th April, 1993 on the management giving 15 days time to settle the demands. The management instead of settling the dispute all of a sudden on 1st July, 1993 stopped the present workman and 22 other workmen on the gate. They lodged a complaint with the Labour Inspector and the management was summoned to appear and produce record on 13th July, 1993. The management did not produce the record before the Labour Inspector on 13th July, 1993 and so they were advised to serve demand notice. The termination of his services effected in this manner by the management is illegal and unjustified. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service with full back wages.

3. Notice was sent to the management under registered cover to appear in the court but it was received back undelivered with the remarks of the postal authorities that they had refused to take notice. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has adduced evidence by filling affidavit containing the aforesaid position.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted position given in the affidavit that the services of the workman were terminated illegally in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

The 23rd December, 1994.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 81, dated the 2nd January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./179.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Refractories (P) Ltd., Faridabad *versus* Smt. Ganga Devi.

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 197 of 1994

*between*

**THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA REFRactories (P) LTD.,  
PLOT NO. 65-66, SECTOR 25, FARIDABAD**

*and*

**THE WORKMAN NAMELY :—SMT. GANGA DEVI C/O FARIDABAD KAMGAR  
UNION (REGD.), CITU OFFICE, BHUD COLONY,  
OLD FARIDABAD**

**Present :**

Shri Rakesh Bansal, for the workman.

None, for the management.

**AWARD**

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (l) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (here-in-after referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government Endorsement No. 24761—67, dated 24th June, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Smt. Ganga Devi, is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is she entitled to ?

2. The case of the workman is that she was appointed by the management as helper on 1st August, 1986 and her last drawn wages were Rs. 1,034.60. The employees union served a demand notice dated 10th April, 1993 on the management given 15 days time on 1st July, 1993 to settle the demands. The management instead of settling the dispute all of a sudden on 1st July, 1993 stopped

the present workman and 22 other workmen on the gate. They lodged a complaint with the Labour Inspector and the management was summoned to appear and produce record on 13th July, 1993. The management did not produce the record before the Labour Inspector on 13th July, 1993 and so they were advised to serve demand notice. The termination of his services effected in this manner by the management is illegal and unjustified. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in to service with full back wages.

3. Notice was sent to the management under registered cover to appear in the court but it was received back undelivered with the remarks of the postal authorities that they had refused to take notice. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has led evidence by filing affidavit containing the aforesaid position.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted position given in the affidavit that the services of the workman were terminated illegally in violation of the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

The 23rd December, 1994.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 82, dated the 2nd January, 1995.

A copy with, (three spare copies), is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary, to the Government of Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./180.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Refractories (P) Ltd., Faridabad *versus* Shri Chander.

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 211/94**

*between*

**THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA REFRactories (P) LTD.,  
PLCT NO. 65-66, SECTOR 25, FARIDABAD**

*and*

**THE WORKMAN NAMELY :—SHRI CHANDER C/O FARIDABAD KAMGAR  
UNION (REGD.), CITU OFFICE, BHUD COLONY,  
OLD FARIDABAD**

*Present :*

Shri Rakesh Bansal, for the workman.  
None, for the management.

**AWARD**

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of subsection (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties, mentioned above to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government Endorsement No. 24840—45, dated 24th June, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Chander, is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief, is he entitled to ?

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed by the management as operator on 1st April, 1976 and his last drawn wages were Rs. 1,119.60. The employees union served a demand notice dated 10th April, 1993 on the management giving 15 days time to settle the demands. The management instead of settling the dispute all of a sudden on 1st July, 1993 stopped the present workman and 22 other workmen on the gate. They lodged a complaint with the Labour Inspector and the management was summoned to appear and produce record on 13th July, 1993. The management did not produce the record before the Labour Inspector on 13th July, 1993 and so they were advised to serve demand notice. The termination of his services effected in this manner by the management is illegal and unjustified. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service with full back wages.

3. Notice was sent to the management under registered cover to appear in the court but it was received back undelivered with the remarks of the postal authorities that they had refused to take notice. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has led evidence by filing affidavit containing the aforesaid position.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted position given in the affidavit that the services of the workman were terminated illegally in violation of the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Dated the 23rd December, 1994.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 79, dated the 2nd January, 1995.

A copy with three spare copies is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./181.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Refractories (P) Ltd., Faridabad *versus* Shri Rajan :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 202/94

*between*

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA REFRactories (P) LTD.,  
PLOT NO. 65-66, SECTOR-25, FARIDABAD

*.. Management.*

*versus*

THE WORKMAN NAMELY SHRI RAJAN, S/O NIKU RAM, C/O  
FARIDABAD KAMGAR UNION (REGD.), C.I.T.U. OFFICE,  
BHUD COLONY, OLD FARIDABAD

*.. Workman.*

*Present :*

Shri Rakesh Bansal, for the workman.

None, for the management.

### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (here-in-after referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above, to this court for adjudication, vide Haryana Government Endorsement No. 24786-91, dated 24th June, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajan is legal and justified? If not, to what relief, is he entitled to?

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed by the management as sweeper on 1st March, 1987 and his last drawn wages were Rs. 1,104.60. The employees union served a demand notice dated 10th April, 1993 on the management giving 15 days time to settle the demands. The management instead of settling the dispute all of a sudden on 1st July, 1993 stopped the present workman and 22 other workmen on the gate. They lodged a complaint with the Labour Inspector and the management was summoned to appear and produce record on 13th July, 1993. The management did not produce the record before the Labour Inspector on 13th July, 1993 and so they were advised to serve demand notice. The termination of his services effected in this manner by the management is illegal and unjustified. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service with full back wages.

3. Notice was sent to the management under registered cover to appear in the court but it was received back undelivered with the remarks of the postal authorities that they had refused to take notice. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has led evidence by filing affidavit containing the aforesaid position.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted position given in the affidavit that the services of workman were terminated illegally in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 78, dated 2nd January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./184—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Escorts Ltd., Motor Cycle and Scooter Division, Faridabad *versus* Shri Jagdish Chander.

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 531/92

*between*

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ESCORTS LTD., MOTOR CYCLE AND  
SCOOTER DIVISION, 19/6, MATHURA ROAD, FERIDABAD

*versus*

THE WORKMAN NAMELY, SHRI JAGDISH CHANDER, C/O SHRI K. L.  
SHARMA, G-254/A, SECTOR-16, FARIDABAD.

*Present :*

Shri K. L. Sharma, for the workman.

Shri S. S. Sethi, for the management.

## AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above, to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government Endorsement No. 56658—66, dated the 17th December, 1992:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jagdish Chander, is legal and justified. If not, to what relief, is he entitled to?

2. Both the parties were summoned and they appeared. Issues were framed on the pleadings of the parties.

3. At the aforesaid stage, the parties have settled the dispute amicably as per position depicted in the settlement deed Ex. S-1. The dispute referred for adjudication does not survive. The award is passed accordingly.

The 2nd January, 1995.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court-II, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 110, dated the 17th January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court-II, Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab/197.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Civil Administrator, Faridabad Complex Administration, N. I. T., Faridabad *versus* Vedpal.

BEFORE SHRI N. L. PRUSHI, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 185 of 93.

IN THE MATTER OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

*between*

SHRI VEDPAL, S/O SHRI KISHAN CHAND, C/O SHRI B. L. GUPTA,  
7-C/843, NIT, FARIDABAD

... *Claimant*

CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR, FARIDABAD COMPLEX ADMINISTRATION,  
N. I. T., FARIDABAD

... *Respondent*

*Present :*

Shri B. L. Gupta, authorised representative for the workman.

Respondent *Ex parte*.

## AWARD

Under the provisions of section 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as Act), the Government of Haryana have, *vide* Endorsement No. ID/FD/19009—14, dated 14th May, 1993, referred the following dispute between the parties above mentioned for adjudication :—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Vedpal is legal and justified. If not, to what relief he is entitled ?”

2. The case of the workman is that he was taken in employment by the Complex Administration with effect from 10th November, 1987 and had been performing duties such as Tube-well Operator Beldar etc. His last drawn wages were Rs. 625 p. m. and his work and conduct was quite satisfactory. His allegation is that the respondent terminated his services on 26th February, 1989 without any reason and without complying with the mandatory provisions of section 25-N, 25-G and 25-F of the Act, i. e. he was neither paid notice pay nor retrenchment compensation. It has also been alleged by the workman that while terminating his services, the Complex Administration had retained in service persons junior to him. It is on these facts that the workman has claimed his reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. On receipt of notice, the Complex Administration had put in appearance on 25th January, 1994. It took six dates viz. 18th February, 1994, 15th April, 1994, 16th May, 1994, 27th May, 1994, 25th July, 1994 and 26th August, 1994, for filing written statement. Instead of filing written statement of 26th August, 1994, the Administration chose to remain absent with the result that it was proceeded *ex parte* and the workman was called upon to lead *ex parte* evidence.

4. In his examination as WW-1, workman Vedpal reiterated all the facts as mentioned in para-2 above. He also stated that Mange Ram who was employed in his place is still continuing to be in service. So, when the respondent has chosen not to contest the case, please take in the documents / claim statement stand proved from the testimony of workman examined as WW-1. Therefore, it is held that the termination of services of Vedpal is illegal and unjustified and he is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages. An award is passed accordingly.

The 30th November, 1994.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 3908, dated 30th November, 1994.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

N. L. PRUTHI,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad,

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./185.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s HAFED, Hodal versus Shri Lakhram.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT-II, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 135/94

*between*

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HAFED HODEL, DISTT. FARIDABAD

*versus*

THE WORKMAN NAMELY :—SHRI LEKHRAM, S/O SHRI BHIM SINGH,  
VILLAGE PANGAL TO, TEHSIL PALWAL,  
DISTT. FARIDABAD.

*Present :*

Shri B. S. Yadav, authorised representative for the workman.

None, for the management.

## AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above, to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government Endorsement No. 20011—15, dated 19th May, 1994 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lekhram is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief, is he entitled to ?

2. Briefly stated the case of the workman is that he was appointed as peon/chowkidar on 4th April, 1985 and his last drawn salary was Rs. 1,056 per month. His services record has been very good through out. He had not given any opportunity of complaint regarding his work and conduct. His services were illegally terminated with effect from 1st November, 1993 without assigning any reason or justification and payment of retrenchment compensation under section 25-F of the Act. He is thus, entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages.

3. Both the parties were summoned. The workman appeared. Notice sent to the management under ordinary post stood unresponded. Fresh notice under registered cover was sent to the management but it was not received undelivered. Consequently, it was ordered that the management be proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. The workman has examined himself in *ex parte* evidence. He has confirmed the aforesaid position on oath.

5. I have heard the authorised representative of the workman and have also gone through his statement.

6. It stands proved from the unrebutted evidence of the workman that he had been in the employment of the management with effect from 4th April, 1985 to 31st October, 1993 and his services were terminated illegally with effect from 1st November, 1993 without following the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. Consequently, it is held that the termination of services of the workman by the management is illegal and unjustified. Resultantly the workman is entitled to be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Dated the 10th January, 1995.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 96, dated the 16th January, 1995.

A copy with three spare copies is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

The 6th February, 1995

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./186—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Om Engineering Works, Mangla Udyog (P) Ltd., Palwal *versus* Shri Bharat Singh.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI U. B. KHANDUJA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT-II,  
FARIDABAD

Ref. No. 456/93

*between*

THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S OM ENGINEERING WORKS, MANGLA UDYOG PVT.  
LTD., 62/2, MATHURA ROAD, PALWAL, DISTT. FARIDABAD

*versus*

THE WORKMAN NAMELY SHRI BHARAT SINGH, S/O SHRI GANGA LAL, C/O  
FARIDABAD KAMGAR UNION (REGD.), BHUD COLONY, OLD FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri C. S. Sharma, AR, for the workman.

Shri G. S. Choudhary, AR, for the management.

## AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the parties mentioned above, to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Haryana Government Endorsement No. 44605—610, dated the 21st September, 1992 :—

Whether the termination/retirement of services of Shri Bharat Singh is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled to?

2. Both the parties summoned and they appeared.

3. The parties have settled the dispute amicably. The workman has been paid a sum of Rs. 10,625 by way of full and final dues. He has given up his right for his reinstatement. The dispute referred for adjudication does not survive. The award is passed accordingly.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Dated the 10th January, 1995.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 97, dated the 16th January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

U. B. KHANDUJA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II,  
Faridabad.

The 7th February, 1995

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./187.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s D.A.V. Public School, Sector-14, Faridabad *versus* Baljit Singh.

BEFORE SHRI N. L. PRUTHI, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 432 of 1991

In the matter of Industrial Dispute.

*between*

SHRI BALJIT SINGH, C/O SHRI ASHOK KUMAR, H. NO. 1687,  
SECTOR-16, FARIDABAD

... Workman

*and*

M/S D. A. V. PUBLIC SCHOOL, SECTOR-14, FARIDABAD

... Management

Present :

Workman with Shri Hoob Lal Yadav.

Shri Jagbir Bhadauria, Authorised Representative for management.

## AWARD

Under the provisions of section 10(1) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of Haryana have,—*vide* Endst. No. SOV/FD/159-91/38223—28, dated 30th October, 1991, referred the following dispute between the parties above named for adjudication :—

Whether termination of services of Shri Baljit Singh, is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief he is entitled ?

2. The matter has been settled at Rs. 5,000 (Rs. Five thousand only). The amount has been paid in cash to the workman in the court today. His statement that he abandons all his rights including his right of reinstatement recorded. No more dispute now survives in this case. An award is passed accordingly. Cash voucher Ex. S-1 shall form part of award.

The 11th January, 1995.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court-I, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 112, dated the 16th January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court-I, Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./188.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sidana Engineering Works, Plot No. 171, Sector 24, N. I. T., Faridabad *versus* Krishna Prasad.

BEFORE SHRI N. L. PRUTHI, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 65 of 1990

In the matter of Industrial Dispute,

*between*

SHRI KRISHAN PRASAD, C/O H. M. S., AZAD NAGAR, BALLABGARH, .. Workman  
FARIDABAD

*and*

M/S SIDANA ENGINEERING WORKS, PLOT NO. 171, SECTOR-24, N.I.T., .. Management  
FARIDABAD

Present :

Workman in person.

Shri R. C. Sharma, authorised representative for management.

#### AWARD

Under the provisions of Section 10(1) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of Haryana have,—*vide* Endorsement No. OV/FD/26-90/6965—70, dated 16th February, 1990 referred the following dispute between the parties above named for adjudication :—

Whether termination of services of Shri Krishan Prasad is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. The matter has been settled at Rs. 10,500. Two cheques of Rs. 5250 and 5250 (total Rs. 10500) bearing Nos. FRB 0970696, dated 13th January, 1995 Bank of India and NAB 815772, dated 12th January, 1995 Indian Bank have been given to the workman by the authorised representative of Management. Statement of the workman has also been recorded. No more dispute now survives in this case. An award is passed accordingly.

Dated 16th January, 1995.

N. L. PRUTHI,  
Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court I,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 273, dated the 19th January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court-I, Faridabad.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./189.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Auto Pins (India) Ltd., 16, Industrial Area, Faridabad *versus* Surender Kumar Sharma.

BEFORE SHRI N. L. PRUTHI, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 143 of 1993

In the matter of Industrial Dispute.

*between*

SHRI SURENDER KUMAR SHARMA, H. NO. 46, GALLI NO. 5, N. I. T.,  
FARIDABAD

... *Workman*

*and*

M/S AUTO PINS (INDIA) LTD., 16, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

... *Management*.

*Present:*

Shri Hoob Lal, Authorised Representative for workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, Authorised Representative for management.

#### AWARD

Under the provisions of Section 10(1) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of Haryana have,—*vide* Endorsement No. 1D/35468—73, dated 14th September, 1993 referred the following dispute between the parties above named for adjudication :—

Whether termination of services of Shri Surender Kumar Sharma is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. The matter is shown to have been settled on 30th December, 1994 by virtue of which payment of an amount of Rs. 37111.85 was made. Ex. S-1 is settlement and Ex. S-2 and Ex. 3 are receipts signed by the workman. No more dispute now survives in this case. An award is passed accordingly. Settlement Ex. S-1 and receipts Ex. S-2 and S-3 shall form part of the award.

Dated the 16th January, 1995.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 272, dated 19th January, 1995.

A copy, with three spare copies, is forwarded to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour Department, Chandigarh.

N. L. PRUTHI,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I,  
Faridabad.